

PEIR/S
Public
Comments

Memorandum

Date: June 2, 1998

To: BDAC Members

From: Lester A. Snow
CALFED Bay-Delta Program



Subject: Public Hearing Comments

Summary

There were 17 public hearings. Attached is a summary of comments made at each hearing. There are particular items/issues that have been raised in each hearing. These are outlined in the following Detailed Discussion section. Four items are mentioned most often:

- The Program should implement water development actions (storage and/or conveyance);
- Agriculture is being asked to pay more than their fair share;
- The Program should move away from water development actions and focus on a 4th alternative which stresses water use efficiency; and
- Water conservation efforts are being maximized in urban and agricultural areas.

Detailed Discussion

The following presents items/issues offered by the three major stakeholder groups (Urban, Environmental and Agriculture) in each region. Items that were spoken to by the majority of speakers in that region or at a particular meeting in that region are highlighted with an "**".

Southern California (Ontario, Burbank, Irvine and Encinitas)

- *Urban speakers indicated the work they have been doing to conserve water, that better water quality, as a result of the Program, will allow them to conserve/recycle even more and irrespective of conservation efforts they will need more water and look to the Program for some of that water. They are willing to pay their fair share but not keen on paying for others.

CALFED Agencies

California
The Resources Agency
Department of Fish and Game
Department of Water Resources
California Environmental Protection Agency
State Water Resources Control Board

Federal
Environmental Protection Agency
Department of the Interior
Fish and Wildlife Service
Bureau of Reclamation
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Department of Agriculture
Natural Resources Conservation Service
Department of Commerce
National Marine Fisheries Service

Public Hearing Comments

June 2, 1998

Page Two

- *Environmental groups called for the need to work harder at improving our water use efficiency program.
- Agriculture asked that their water needs not be forgotten and asked that agricultural lands not be taken out of production.

San Joaquin Valley (Fresno and Bakersfield)

- Urban speakers stated opposition to mandated water conservation measures. They also indicated they would need to know project costs if they were to be expected to support the preferred alternative.
- Environmental groups called for the need to work harder at improving our water use efficiency program particularly in the agriculture arena.
- *Agriculture has asked that agricultural lands not be taken out of production. Stated opposition to regulatory driven water conservation. They asked the Program to move forward with storage and conveyance to meet the growing need for water. They are willing to pay for benefits they will receive but unwilling to pay for other stakeholders.

Delta (Walnut Grove, Vacaville, Stockton and Pittsburg)

- Urban water districts asked that the Program select an alternative which improves water quality while keeping the common pool.
- *Environmental groups called for the need to work harder at improving our water use efficiency program and pushed for a 4th alternative which stresses water use efficiency.
- *Agriculture is opposed to sending water in a canal around the Delta. Support additional storage and Alternative 2 as it maintains the common pool. Strong advocates of having the Program comply with existing water rights and local ordinances. Not in favor of taking land out of production.
- All groups looking for improvement of San Joaquin River water quality.

Bay Area (Oakland, San Jose, Santa Rosa and Santa Cruz)

- Urban water districts are seeking improved water quality from the Program as well as an increased water supply.
- *Environmental groups called for the need to work harder at improving our water use efficiency program, particularly in the agriculture arena, and pushed for a 4th alternative which stresses water use efficiency. They emphasized the need for a clear accounting of the costs and benefits of all alternatives to demonstrate practicality of facilities vs. conservation.
- Agriculture noted opposition to taking lands out of production and need for additional storage.

Public Hearing Comments

June 2, 1998

Page Three

Sacramento Valley (Chico, Yuba City and Redding)

- Urban interests are concerned about impacts of the ERP on infrastructure.
- Environmental groups called for the need to work harder at improving our water use efficiency program, particularly in the agriculture arena, and pushed for a 4th alternative which stresses water use efficiency.
- Agriculture supports storage.
- *Both agriculture and urban stressed the need for protection of water, property and area of origin rights and adherence to local ordinances covering groundwater storage or water transfer actions.